

[Mr. A. Govinda Menon.]

THE NAIR REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. K. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Tiruvalla*): Sir, in view of the lamented death of the mover of the Nair Regulation Amendment Bill, I move for permission being granted to me to take charge of the Bill and to continue it in the Council.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I beg to second that motion.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I beg to support that motion.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Govinda Menon, am I to take it that you withdraw your motion?

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): Yes, Sir.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir though there does not seem to be any specific provision for the step proposed, I believe, that the general principle mentioned in Standing Order No. 4 may be applied in this case and permission granted. Standing Order No. 4 says:

"On the dissolution of a Council, all Government Bills which have been introduced shall be carried over to the pending list of business to the next Council and all private Bills shall lapse unless the member in charge of the Bill is returned to the new Council or the Council on a motion of any other member desiring to take charge of the same makes a special order for the continuance of the Bill."

In other words, if, in the new Council, a member of the old Council ceases to be a member, the Bill introduced by him may be taken charge of by another. In this particular case, the mover of the original Bill having ceased to be a member, I do not think there will be any objection to Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai's continuing the Bill.

PRESIDENT: May I take it that the House accepts the motion?

The motion was carried.

The following motion standing in the name of Mr. A. Govinda Menon was not moved:—

That in place of the late Mr. K. P. Raman Pillai B. A., B. L., Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai B. A., B. L., be made the mover of the Nair Regulation Amendment Bill.

RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

Prohibition of Cow-killing.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): Sir, I beg to move the following resolution:—

That this Council recommends to the Government the necessity of early legislation prohibiting the killing of cows in this State.

The considerations which have prompted me to bring in this resolution are economic, humanitarian and religious. The importance of each of these aspects would necessarily vary with each of us. To the utilitarian and the materialist, the economic aspects would be all-important; whereas to those of a human and refined temperament the humanitarian aspect would appeal with the greatest effect. With the Hindu, it is the religious aspect that would count most; for he regards the cow as a sacred animal and believes that to bring about her destruction in any manner would bring on him the punishments prescribed for one of the deadliest crimes known to his religion.

To an agricultural people like us the economic value of the cow is indeed inestimable; without good cows, we cannot get good cattle to plough our fields and to supply us with manure. Moreover, a rice-eating nation like us could not afford to live without cow's milk and its various products. These facts were well-recognised by our people in days gone by. The remnants now in existence in middle and north Travancore of cattle sheds built by our ancestors in many cases, with as much care as if not better, than was usually bestowed on family houses, show how much value they set upon their cattle. The ample village pastures supplied them with enough fodder in the day, and the storages of hay and straw they carefully collected and kept fed them in the night. Our cattle then were in no way inferior to those of the neighbouring British districts and we had enough of them to plough all our fields in those days. Times have changed and the condition of our cattle now is the worst imaginable. Indiscriminate slaughter of cattle, especially of cows, for purposes of human food, insufficient pasture for grazing, indifferent care bestowed on the rearing and keeping of cattle—these and many other causes have, in recent years, conspired together to produce the deplorable condition of our cattle and consequently of the ryot at the present day. No accurate statistics as to the number of our cattle exist, and the approximate figures which alone are available to us show that, whereas in British India they have sixty-one head of cattle per hundred of the population, we have here only twenty-five. And when we take into account the inferiority of even these few we possess, the explanation of the enormous amount disbursed by our ryots in foreign markets for the purchase of cattle is obvious.

Not agriculture alone has suffered from this culpable neglect of our cattle; human life, as is shown by the high rate of infant mortality in this country, has also suffered considerably from want of cow's milk. Every family and homestead formerly possessed a few cows which yielded milk sufficient to satisfy the needs of the children and the adult members of the family. Cows are a luxury now and consequently the children especially suffer for want of sufficient nutritious food. What cows we possess do not yield even a fourth of the quantity which those in the neighbouring parts of British India yield; scarcity of fodder and pasturage, deterioration in breed, indifference to breeding and rearing cows, and indiscriminate slaughter of cows for meat are among the causes which have brought about this sad state of affairs.

[Mr. A. Govinda Menon.]

It is highly gratifying to note that the problems of our milk supply and of the improvement of our cattle have lately engaged the serious attention of the Economic Development Board. In a short paper read at a recent meeting of that Board by Mr. S. K. Dharwardkar, he dealt with those problems briefly and concisely but with telling force, and the various suggestions offered by him for remedying the present state of affairs did all meet with the full approval of the Board. The first of those suggestions relates to the complete prohibition of the slaughter of cows in this State and the reasons advanced by Mr. Dharwardkar in support of this suggestion are all based on a consideration of the economic aspect of the question.

The duty and the necessity of protecting the cow from the hands of the butcher on the score solely of her importance as a vital economic factor in the life of an agricultural population have been recognised in recent times by non-Hindu Rulers such as H. E. H. the Nizam, H. H. the Begum of Bhopal and H. M. the Amir of Afghanistan who have prohibited the slaughter of cows in their dominions. Eminent men like Sir John Woodroffe, Mr. C. F. Andrews and others have advocated such prohibition, throughout India, on both economic and humanitarian grounds.

The humanitarian aspect of the question needs no pleading at my hands. The cow is to the Indian an absolute necessity. She attends to his comforts from birth; she feeds him with milk throughout his childhood and supplies him also with butter and butter-milk till his death. Her milk and its products, butter and butter-milk, are essential to him throughout his life. Her male offspring till his fields for him and she and her children provide him with a good quantity of manure. She is as it were the guardian angel of the health and the prosperity of the Indian household. She is supremely gentle and loving by disposition. Is it just, then, to place her under the butcher's knife? Is it not our duty to protect her under all circumstances? Let alone this humanitarian point of view; self-interest even plainly dictates to us our paramount duty to guard her against all who may wish to lay violent hands on her.

The cow is sacred to all Hindus irrespective of caste. She is the emblem of prosperity. To hurt her ever so slightly is sinful and he who slaughters her commits one of the five deadly sins which are practically inexpiable. This is a Hindu State and Hindus form over 70 per cent. of its population. The major portion of the non-Hindu population are Christians, but, even among a good many of them, there is a sentimental aversion to cow's meat. Among the Mahomedan population too, there are many who avoid the use of cow's flesh. This country abounds in other animals which could supply the needs of the meat-eating population. Why not then spare the cow from the butcher's knife in deference to the sentiments of the majority of the people and in view of its economic value in our households?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I beg to know whether Mr. Govinda Menon objects to the slaughter of bulls also.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I do not object to the slaughter of bulls.

I need not say that nearly 70 per cent. of the population of the State are Hindus and even a good number of the other communities consists of Christians who do not eat cow's flesh. Even to this day, in spite of the reformed ideas of Christianity and advanced education, there are Christians who object to eat cow's flesh in rural parts. In town parts also, I have met with Christian High Court Vakils and other respectable gentlemen who have told me that they have never touched cow's flesh. It is not exactly the sentiment which inspires the Hindus which makes the Christians averse to eating cow's flesh. It is a kind of traditionally inherited sentiment which, in spite of the religion they now profess, makes them averse to its use.

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): May I ask a question of the member, whether the Christian religion sanctions the killing of cows?

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): So far as I have been able to ascertain, the Christian religion is a religion of love. It not only does not allow but prohibits even the doing of the least harm to any man or animal in the world. But, unfortunately, it may have been interpreted in different ways by different people; for there are people now who say that all animals are created for the use of man. But so far as I have read the Bible, what I have been able to understand is that the teaching of the Bible is quite different from what those people say. Even among Mahomedans there are gentlemen who are against the use of cow's flesh. I may instance Mr. Khadir Pillai who belongs to an ancient family, and who is, to my knowledge, not used to eating cow's flesh. But it is not exactly the same sentiment that inspires a Hindu that induces them to abstain from using cow's flesh. I shall quote an instance which took place some two years ago to show that this is not a question which is brought forward simply because of religious beliefs which one may hold—I for one may say that I am not an orthodox Hindu. My point of view is more economic and utilitarian than religious. Of course, the religious point also counts to some extent. A large meeting was convened at Salem two years ago under the presidency of the General Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. at which a resolution was brought forward by a Tamilian gentleman and was supported by two of the leading Mahomedan gentlemen of the place. All the prominent Mahomedan leaders are of opinion that cow-slaughter should be prevented. As far as Christian leaders are concerned, all the leading humanitarian propagandists now in existence—most of them are Americans and Englishmen—are generally averse to any kind of slaughter of cattle. And I do not think that any section of the people—they may belong to any caste or religion—would object to this. In many of the municipalities in northern India, and even in some of the municipalities in southern India, restrictions are placed on the slaughter of cows.

[Mr. Joseph Panjikaran.]

In the States of Kolhapur, Baroda, Kashmir, Gwalior, Morvi, Limbdi, Gondal, Bansda, Bilasapur, Dhrangadru (Kathiawarkra, and Barwani (Central India), laws have been promulgated prohibiting entirely the slaughter of cows. I do not claim any special treatment at the hands of this House and at the hands of the Government because of the fact that this is a Hindu State. Although this is a Hindu State, no other State in the world, not even in India, can boast of the tolerance which it has meted out to other religious bodies. (*Hear, hear.*) Just a few days ago, a friend of mine told me that, in a State in northern India, a missionary wanted to acquire a few cents of land and that he was promptly told that no such thing would be allowed. In this place every religious body is welcomed and is allowed to acquire lands. In such circumstances, what I merely ask is whether, if we Hindus, who form three-fourths of the whole population of this State, want to prohibit the slaughter of cows, the other portion of the population should not be charitable enough to extend towards us, their neighbours the same toleration which we now extend and have for centuries been extending to them in the matter of their religion. This is only a very small thing. There are so many varieties of animals existing in this State. The State abounds in forests which contain a large number of animals whose flesh is fit for food. After all, cow's flesh is not very much used even among non-Hindus as it may be generally supposed by an outsider. From the facts I have mentioned as regards Christians and Mahomedans, especially in rural areas, it can be seen that they practically object to the use of cow's flesh. I therefore trust that my resolution will be unanimously supported by all here without any dissentient voice.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertallai*): I want to ask Mr. Govinda Menon a question before he sits down. Do the Hindu Shastras anywhere make it a duty on the Hindu to see that the killing of cows even by others is prohibited? (*Laughter*).

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangal cum Parur*): Yes. I can quote a *sloka* from Manu if he wants.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertallai*): It is for information that I ask.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangal cum Parur*): This is what Manu says:

"All are murderers the man who advises the killing of a creature, the man who kills, the man who flays, the man who purchases, the man who sells, the man who cooks the flesh, the man who distributes it and the man who eats it."

Such is the wide prohibition regarding the killing of cows that is given by Manu.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertallai*): I am afraid that it does not answer my question. My question is whether the Hindu Sastras anywhere make it a duty on a Hindu to see that the killing of cows by others is prohibited.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I suppose that the passage I quoted is comprehensive enough to cover all imaginable cases.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertallai*): So far as I have been able to understand—

PRESIDENT: You cannot comment upon it. That is his answer. You may put any interpretation upon it you like.

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): Sir,—

PRESIDENT: Is the resolution seconded?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): Sir, I second the resolution and strongly support it. Of all the ruminating animals, the most useful to man and especially so to the agriculturist are the cow and the ox. An agriculturist therefore naturally has a special love and regard for these animals; and in certain cases he would even go to the extent of attaching some sacredness to these animals. Travancore is a country whose mainstay is agriculture and we in south Travancore solely depend or mainly depend upon agriculture. By us the killing of a cow or even an ox or a calf is considered highly objectionable.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know whether the resolution in question covers the case of bulls also?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): It does not. That is what Mr. Govinda Menon said. He has restricted it to cows.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I want to know whether the cow is used for agricultural purposes, *i. e.*, whether it is yoked in tilling the ground for agricultural purposes.

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): Without the cow how can the bulls be produced? (*Laughter.*)

One item in the daily prayer of the Brahmins in the country is for the prosperity of the cow kingdom. Vegetarianism—according to an Encyclopædia which I possess—is as old as the time of Pythagoras, the Greek Philosopher. I thought this could not possibly be true. Then I referred to the Bible. There I found the following first commandment to the first parents in the very first chapter of the very first Book.

“Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the Earth and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be meat.”

Of course vegetarianism has been for generations practised by the Hindus and some others, and it is now being brought to much prominence.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I wish to know whether there were cows in the Garden of Eden. (*Laughter.*)

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): Must have been. Everything was created then.

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf.]

In this connection I think it would be useful if I refer to a prayer made by Daniel the Prophet for himself and three others while he was a captive in Babylon when the king of Babylon offered him and certain other young Israelites for whom he had a special liking, meat and wine of his own table:—

“Give us but pulse, (പുഴു) to eat and water to drink; try us for ten days; we shall grow fatter and better-looking than all the others.”

And this was tried and proved successful. Daniel and his three friends grew not only fatter, and better-looking, but they were wiser as well.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Does it give rise to the presumption that the young Israelites ate cows?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): No. The Israelites never ate cows. That is what I say. Daniel went even a step further than the ordinary vegetarian. He did not even ask for ghee or buttermilk.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Will Mr. Daniel draw the line further away and eschew ghee and buttermilk also besides beef?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): That is not in question here. I have been going through the history of the Israelites at the time when their property mainly consisted of cattle and sheep and I do not remember of any instance where they killed a cow for their food or offered it as sacrifice to their Jehovah. I therefore heartily support the resolution.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Then what did they kill for sacrifice?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): They killed what you call a calf (இளங்கன்று).

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Is it a male or a female one?

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaram*): He-calf.

I therefore strongly support the motion brought forward by my friend Mr. A. Govinda Menon and I earnestly request that Government be pleased to pass the necessary legislation in the matter.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I find myself placed in a very difficult position. (*Laughter*.) It dawns upon me just now that I am a Christian and I find on my left side my friend, the mover of this motion, who is a Hindu, and on my right another old friend, Mr. Khadir Pillai, who is a Mahomedan. And the idea of the devil and the deep sea comes into my mind. (*Laughter*.) I ask this House to forget for a time that I am a Christian, while I am opposing this motion of Mr. Govinda Menon. He has brought forward three aspects of the question, the first economic, the second humanitarian, and the third religious. I shall begin with the economic aspect of the question.

That the slaughter of cows should be prohibited for the purpose of increasing our milk supply and the number of our cattle is what is urged. This prohibition assumes that milch cows and cows capable of calving are being slaughtered for the food of man and beasts of prey. As a matter of fact no cow yielding milk or capable of calving in the near future is ever slaughtered for the above purposes. No sane man will ever sell a cow yielding milk to a butcher, for it is impossible for him on account of the very low price of beef to offer a price sufficiently tempting to the owner to part with his milch cow. Then there is the cow which has ceased yielding milk. The owner may think that it may not become pregnant.

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaran*): May I ask a question?

PRESIDENT: Let him finish his sentence.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): As a rule, a cow gets its period of rut even during the course of milking and invariably within a month or two of its having ceased to yield milk, if it has not become barren.

MR. PAUL V. DANIEL (*Agastisvaran*): May I know whether cows are being killed only by persons who buy cows to dispose of their flesh and whether persons owning cows do not also slaughter them for their use?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): The very same argument applies there also. The cow that is taken to the slaughter house is invariably barren.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): May I know how the barrenness of the cow is demonstrated?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Just the same way as in the case of women.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): How long should it be tried?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): The same as in the case of the barrenness of a woman. But the period is different.

The cow which goes to the slaughter-house is invariably a barren one or one that is incapable of calving at any future time. This is the general rule.

Then there is the question of the beef-eater who may not relish the flesh of lean or old cows; for this there are always available fat young oxen which are not wanted for breeding or other purposes, such as ploughing or drawing carts. Barren cows are fat and they are not always old. For the carnivora useless old bullocks are slaughtered.

Thus it is quite clear that the cows slaughtered are those which are incapable of adding to the milk supply, but, on the contrary, their removal serves a very useful purpose, *viz.*, reducing the dearth of fodder for the milch cows. It is admitted that the supply of fodder and the extent of pasture grounds are very limited and the difficulty of feeding the milch cows during the hot season is very great.

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf.]

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): On this principle we can advocate the shooting of barren women.

PRESIDENT: That is an argument.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I want to know whether Mr. Hoogewerf means by this analogy that all barren women may be done away with.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I am extremely shocked to hear the question asked by Mr. Govinda Menon who places a woman with a soul on quite the same level as a barren cow.

In the towns and their suburbs there are no grazing grounds worth the name and no attempt is made to provide sufficient grazing grounds capable of supplying green fodder throughout the year for a sufficiently large number of cows required to meet the milk supply. The cows which we have now are not of very good milk-yielding breeds.

The slaughter of cows, which my friend wants to prohibit, preserves the milch cows by not depriving them of fodder, and one who seeks the aid of the law to prohibit such slaughter proposes a remedy which is worse than the disease. If all cows are allowed to live, the chances are that the milk supply may eventually disappear, for it is upon the good feeding of the milch cows that the enhancement of the milk supply mainly depends. It is incomprehensible to me how the slaughter of cows has been discovered by my friends to be the cause of the insufficient supply of milk when the actual causes are so obvious to all who have eyes to see.

I have a cow of my own which I purchased for Rs. 80—a fat and beautiful cow. (*Laughter.*) But now she has become barren. I want to dispose of her. I was offered Rs. 5. I do not wish to hand her over to the butcher. Now she is eating into my poor pension. (*Laughter.*) I have to spend four annas every day for her feeding I cannot get rid of her. She is a millstone round my neck as it were. (*Laughter.*) It is the supply of tinned milk from Europe which keeps up the supply of milk for our hospitals.

PRESIDENT: I must remind you that you have got only ten minutes and that you have exhausted your time.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Mr. Govinda Menon referred to infant mortality. Mr. Govinda Menon has cut the ground under him by saying that bulls may be slaughtered. I shall quote what His Excellency the Viceroy said on this question in his reply to the deputation from the All India Cow Conference:

"I now come to the question of milk supply and the condition of milch cattle which we say is deplorable. The rise which has taken place in the price of milk is to be regretted, but there is no evidence that it is due to any deterioration in the quality or quantity of cattle. In point of fact, its price has simply risen in sympathy with that of other commodities, nor can I attribute the high infant mortality which unhappily prevails in this country to reduction in the number of milch cattle. High infant mortality is unfortunately not new in India, and I am in complete sympathy with your desire

to reduce it. It is one of the serious problems of India, but though deeply to be deplored, and while it is undoubtedly attributable in part to defective nutriment, its main causes are to be found in ignorance and the neglect of sanitation. Improvements in the milk supply depends first and foremost on better breeds of cattle.

You will be interested to learn that at the agricultural institute at Pusa cows have been bred which give an average out-turn of thirty-two pounds of milk a day. The goal which we should keep in view is, therefore, a breed of cow which will give the maximum annual yield of milk and the elimination of all animals whose outturn is barely worth their keep.

I shall now take up the religious aspect of the question. The cow is as dear to the Christian as it is to the Hindu. It was in a cow-shed that the Babe of Bethlehem was born. So we have respect for the cow, and if I can help it, I will with one stroke of the pen do away with cow-slaughter—not only cow-slaughter, but the slaughter of sheep, goats, bulls, pigs, etc. I shall next quote what His Excellency the Viceroy said on the religious aspect of the question:

"The slaughter of cattle and especially of cows is a subject bristling with difficulties, owing to its close connection with the religious belief and feelings of a large part of the population; but though I appreciate the motives which must have induced you to avoid a discussion of this aspect of the matter, it is impossible for me to refrain from some mention of it. The bitterness of religious differences has in modern times largely given way to broad-minded toleration, and I only ask that this spirit of toleration may be observed whenever the question of cattle-slaughter is discussed. Respect one another's religious beliefs, but while striving, as far as possible, not to offend against them, do not let any man try to force his own views upon other men and, from the economic point of view, let me ask you to credit with honesty of opinion those persons who tell you that India suffers perhaps not from the fewness, but from the multitude, of her cattle".

PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I just want two or three minutes to finish. With regard to ghee and milk, if ghee and milk which come from inside the cow can be used, why not cow's flesh also?

Now with regard to the humanitarian argument brought forward by Mr. Govinda Menon, he has cut the ground under him. Man implies woman also. But cow does not imply bull in this case.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): May I ask why Mr. Hoogewerf did not send his cow to the slaughter-house?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Because it was with us for a long time and I have a sentiment.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): Would not my friend respect the sentiments of the non-Christians similarly?

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I said so. I am against cow-slaughter. Before the question of cow-killing is taken up, I may ask my friends on this side of the House to deal with the higher question of humanity. We should also protect the jutka ponies and bullocks which are kicked and thumped by their drivers and stop such cruelty by legislation.

[Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai.]

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Is there not the S. P. C. A. to attend to such matters?

PRESIDENT: That is hardly relevant. Mr. Hoogewerf, your time is up.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Before we go down to the animal kingdom, we have also to deal with humanity itself. What about the young Hindu widows, who lose all their liberty and are imprisoned in the house? The question of widow re-marriage should be taken up before we go down to the animal kingdom.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): Sir, Mr. Hoogewerf advises us that we should consider the question of widow re-marriage before we go to the question of legislation regarding cow protection. I must tell him in the very beginning that that question—

PRESIDENT: I do not think that that question arises here.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): That argument of my friend provokes an answer.

PRESIDENT: I have already said that that does not arise.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): I do not want to say anything about it in the light of the observation from the Chair. Anyhow there are the ideals for which certain communities stand and widowhood is an ideal so far as the Hindus are concerned. It is an ideal towards which they strive and which they cherish.

I am assured in favour of cows being protected; but when I learned from the mover of the resolution and one of the gentlemen who supported him that this piece of intended legislation is to cover cows merely and not bulls, I am disposed to think that we ought to have a more far-reaching measure, for the Indian Penal Code does not make any distinction between man and woman so far as offences and punishments are concerned.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): It does.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): There are a few instances—my friend is an astute lawyer—in which women are specially protected. In practice the criminal laws of most countries do not make any distinction between man and woman so far as punishments are concerned. If the cow is sacred according to the Hindu religion, the bull is equally sacred in India. Nandi is God Siva's *Vahanam*; and I am sure a Hindu will certainly hesitate before he sheds the blood of a bull. I want protection to be extended to the bulls which draw our carriages and are used for ploughing the fields from which we get our sustenance. If it is on humanitarian grounds that Mr. Govinda Menon has brought forward this resolution, I may go to the extent of saying that we ought not to

confine our attention to cows alone but extend the protection to bulls, sheep, and all manner of animals, whom a generous Providence has created. Killing an animal that roams in the forests, or invading the sea in order to catch fish, this also goes against humanity. If, therefore, Mr. Govinda Menon takes his stand on that platform, I may say that it should be looked upon only as a thin end of the wedge of benevolence. Our object should be to see that no creature which stands in the same relation to God Almighty as we stand should be killed. If it is a religious measure, it would not be before the Council.

If it is only on economic grounds that Mr. Govinda Menon has been supporting this resolution, before we go into the economic aspect, there are certain legal questions to be considered. The laws of man both in this country and in others recognise certain rights in the owner of property. If I pay my money and buy a cow or a bull or a horse or a dog, I have got a right of property over it. We have seen persons, very charitably disposed gentlemen, shooting down horses which are not serviceable. In the same manner, considered as a question of law, the man who pays for it has a right of ownership over that cow. That is a matter which complicates the question. If I am at liberty to kill my elephant or my horse or my dog, why I should not kill my cow alone, considered as a legal proposition, presents some difficulty. No doubt the sentiment of the community is the most important consideration that weighs with us. The Hindus have been accustomed to regard the cow with great veneration not only at the present day, but for centuries. They have been looking upon the cow as mother. I am glad to find that gentlemen in this House representing religions other than Hinduism take the same view of the veneration that is to be accorded to the cow-mother. But a difficulty will arise in this way. If a man has got a dozen cows and if five or six of them cease to calve, their maintenance, as has been pathetically pointed out by Mr. Hoogewerf, becomes a question of serious difficulty and the maintenance charges make tremendous inroads upon the resources of the owner. In our country there are no organisations to protect cows which are useless. There are no *Pinjrapoles*. A man who is moved by good impulses towards his cows will have to utilise what little money remains in his hand and he may be left without money for the service of his family. That will be a difficulty. This question has been discussed in some manner that religious prejudices may be evoked. It is not because that the majority of the people in Travancore are Hindus that cows should be protected. Travancore has always stood for religious neutrality. Travancoreans want the religion not only of the Hindus but they want the religion of the Christians and the Mahomedans and people of all shades of faith to be freely enjoyed by their respective followers. So that even questions of religious consideration with respect to Christians and Mahomedans are tolerated.

Because the Hindu religion prohibits cow-killing, I do not think the State will be justified, especially in view of the religious toleration in Travancore, in prohibiting the followers of other religions from enjoying their legal rights of ownership in cows, when they have been

[Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.]

exercising that right for so many years in the past, perhaps for hundreds of years. My suggestion, therefore, is to keep the religious question entirely in the background, to forget it in fact for the time being as pointed out by Mr. Hoogewerf, and to look into the broad economic aspect of the question. The mover of the resolution pointed out that even the Mahomedan rulers elsewhere have been so generous as to come to the rescue of the poor cow. I may say that, in this land of religious neutrality and toleration, where the communities do not fight each other on these disputes, especially considering the fact that even people of other persuasions are prepared to support this resolution, I am prepared to accept it as the thin end of the wedge, keeping in view the broader aspect of the future policy of the prevention of slaughter of cows, bulls, goat and sheep. Whatever may be the rights of owners over their property in Travancore where the economic and agricultural needs for cows have been conceded by all subjects of His Highness the Maha Raja, I support the resolution on the broader and more generous basis.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I wish to ask Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai, before he sits down, as to what will happen in 30 or 50 years, if all these animals are not slaughtered. I mean the tiger and the lion and all other animals. Will they not eat us all up? The tiger will come to the town; the pigs may destroy all the crops.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): That seems to be a hypothetical question. Moreover, I am not here under cross-examination. The answer is obvious.

PRESIDENT: You may or may not answer the question.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, Government are in full sympathy with the sentiments underlying the motion. But the difficulty is to give practical effect to it, especially because the mover of the resolution has advanced three grounds, *viz.*, the religious, the economic and the humanitarian aspects of the question, to every one of which there seems to be an answer, and I believe an effective answer too, furnished by the speeches of Messrs. Hoogewerf and T. K. Velu Pillai. I do not think it necessary to advance any new argument except by asking the House to view both sides of the case and judge whether it will be practical politics for Government to undertake such a piece of legislation at this stage. In the first place, Mr. A. Govinda Menon—

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): I wish to ask Mr. Subba Aiyar how the Government have been able to undertake such legislation in other States.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am coming to that.

With reference to the humanitarian aspect of the question, as observed by Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai, why should the cow alone be protected?

why not seek to protect the bull or the sheep or the goat? So far as that matter is concerned, it is more a matter for education than for legislation. I daresay Mr. Lakshmana Pillai and his co-workers are trying very hard to put an end to the slaughter of all animals, and when their preaching becomes effective and people are educated, slaughter, as such, I believe, will be put an end to. Apart from that, on that particular aspect, it is not possible to legislate, because protection in that case need not be limited to the cow alone.

Then, with regard to the religious point of view, although the Hindu regards it as a very sacred animal, other religionists do not regard it as such. As Mr. Velu Pillai observed, the State has to observe religious neutrality in all matters. For the sake of a particular religion, to ask other religionists who have no scruples on the question of slaughter, not to slaughter, I say, will be rather hard. Mr. Govinda Menon has pointed out that 70 per cent. of the population are Hindus and they do not slaughter cows, that, therefore, so far as they are concerned they will have no objection, and that the Christians that he knew do not eat meat. So also some of his Mahomedan friends. If that is so, and if the Hindus, Christians and Mahomedans all agree to pay regard to the sentiments of the Hindus in refraining from the slaughter of cows, then, I say, it is a matter for mutual arrangement to see that one religionist sympathises and respects the sentiments and feelings of the others, rather than for statutory prohibition and legislative interference on the part of the State.

Coming to the economic aspect of the question, I was listening very carefully to the speech of Mr. Govinda Menon and I thought that he would make out a case as to the necessity for such legislation, because the first thing that is essential before legislation is undertaken in any matter is the proof of the *necessity* for it. He has not said anything about the necessity therefor. He has said that there has been a considerable deterioration in the growth of cows. We do not know whether it is due to their slaughter. Whether the cow has deteriorated, whether the number of cows has diminished, and if so, whether that decrease is due to slaughter, all these have to be ascertained before we can do anything in the matter.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I ask whether the Government have any statistics on the matter?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): No; unfortunately we have not been collecting any statistics about that.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I know the number of cows slaughtered annually in the State?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): No information is available on that subject either.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): As a point of personal explanation, I may say that I advanced, as one of the causes of the deterioration of the cows, the fact of their indiscriminate slaughter.

[Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.]

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am trying to meet that argument also.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I wish to know whether the ancient Greeks and the Hindus were akin?

PRESIDENT: It is a question of ethnology.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am not an ethnologist. I do not profess to be an expert in that matter.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Were not the Greeks cow-killers?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I do not know ancient history. I think Professor Rangaswami Aiyangar will be able to answer that question.

As for the causes of the deterioration of, and decrease in, the number of cows, I will rather leave it to Dr. Kunjan Pillai to explain them. Whether that is due to the climatic conditions of Travancore or whether good cows can thrive well in Travancore, are matters which can better be left to Dr. Kunjan Pillai to answer.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): Is Mr. Subba Aiyar aware that the Economic Development Board has considered the question and passed a resolution on the subject?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am coming to that. With reference to the economic aspect of the case, arguments were advanced by Mr. Govinda Menon showing the necessity for protecting cows. It was also stated clearly by Messrs. Hoogewerf and T. K. Velu Pillai that, as the population increased, every area that had been used as a grazing ground was being taken up for cultivation. Since it will be absolutely necessary to maintain milch cows, I think it will be rather difficult for a person to maintain barren cows along with the others. Mr. Hoogewerf says that one of his barren cows is eating away a considerable portion of his pension. That, I say, is not a matter entirely to be ignored. While it is necessary to maintain milch cows it is equally necessary not to throw any additional burden upon any poor person of maintaining cows which are absolutely useless. Now, if we cannot dispose of them, the only thing to be done is to let them loose and they will be standing or lying in the streets or eat others' crops and get themselves impounded, in which case we have to recommend only a course of starvation for these cows.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Are there not sufficient vacant grounds everywhere?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): In places which are near the forests there might be grazing grounds; but in towns and places around towns, I do not think we can get much

vacant space. Therefore cows that have been let loose will only be disposed to eat away other people's crops or to trespass into other people's gardens and do mischief there.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Is it not possible to leave them in forest reserves?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Of course, there is a provision for grazing cattle outside forest reserves on a small payment, but that provision does not seem to be extensively taken advantage of.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): If my cow trespasses into my neighbour's garden planted with gram, am I not liable to be prosecuted?

PRESIDENT: That is exactly what Mr. Subba Aiyar is saying.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Cows let loose are liable to do mischief and therefore I say that it will be rather too hard for a poor person to maintain useless cows, and it will also not be desirable to let them loose. Therefore, even from the economic point of view, I do not think that Mr. Govinda Menon is quite correct.

Then again, Mr. Govinda Menon stated that, in some Municipalities, this was being been done; and it is there that I am trying to attack him and attack him personally, because he is himself the President of a Municipality.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): I rise to a point of order. The Law Member said that he was going to attack Mr. Govinda Menon *personally*. According to the rules, I do not think he can do so.

PRESIDENT: In saying so, certainly Mr. Subba Aiyar did not mean to say that he was going to abuse Mr. Govinda Menon.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I said so, because Mr. Govinda Menon is the President of a Municipal Council, and if he was against cow-killing, he might have passed a resolution in the Parur Municipal Council that the flesh of animals slaughtered outside could be brought within the municipal limits only with the permission of the Council. The Council has the liberty to make bye-laws to that effect.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): May I inform the Law Member that such a bye-law has been passed by the Municipal Council, Parur?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I was not aware of it. Under section 244 of the Municipal Regulation, the Municipal Councils can pass bye-laws to regulate the slaughter of animals. I say that if the municipality has taken the trouble to regulate the slaughter of animals, then certainly it could restrict indiscriminate slaughter considerably. If he had done so, I would have

[President.]

expected statistics from him as to how, in spite of the bye-law, a large number of cows are slaughtered in his own municipality, and then he would have been in a position to show that the intervention of Government in the matter is absolutely necessary. There are also representatives of other municipalities here. In the first place, Municipal Councils may try; and if the bye-laws made by them are not effective, then it may be a question to be placed before the Government and their being asked to interfere in the matter.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): May I know whether, if a municipality sends up such a bye-law, the Government are prepared to sanction it? It can become law only after it is sanctioned by the Government. Are the Government prepared to approve such bye-laws if they are sent up?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Government may approve of them if they are strictly within the provisions of the Municipal Regulation. The municipality must not indiscriminately prohibit the slaughter of *all* animals. Such things will have to be considered.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I am now confining my question to the case of cow-slaughter. Supposing cow-slaughter is prohibited by a municipality and the bye-law is sent up to the Government for sanction. Are the Government prepared to sanction it?

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): I rise to a point of order. I do not know if the Deputy President is justified in putting such a question. Under the rules, questions can be asked only for information and not on matters of policy or on hypothetical cases.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): I think, Sir, the fact that I am Deputy President does not take away from me the privilege that every member has of putting questions.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): That is not it, Sir. I referred to him as Deputy President only by way of courtesy.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): In order to help the members of this Council to make up their mind at the time of voting, I wanted to know whether the Government, as a matter of policy, are opposed to permitting municipalities to pass bye-laws prohibiting slaughter of cows.

PRESIDENT: It is a question which is very difficult to answer on the spur of the moment. It is a matter requiring very careful consideration. What Mr. Subba Aiyar said was that the question deserved to be considered when it came up before the Government after consideration by Municipalities.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I only said that some check or control might be had over indiscriminate slaughter of cows. Mr. Hoogewerf says that, from the economic point of view, the maintenance of useless cows is undesirable. That aspect of the question has to be considered. I believe the Municipal Councils are certainly in a position to render very good protection to the cows. At any rate, they can collect statistics as to the number and class of cows slaughtered and see whether any restriction could or could not be placed by virtue of the powers already vested in the municipal council.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): I wish to know whether Mr. Subba Aiyar is aware that the provision in the Municipal Regulation in regard to the slaughter of animals extends only so far as the health and safety of the public are concerned.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): "Public safety, health, and convenience"—I think, these are the words used there. Even taking that wording into consideration, I think the slaughter of cows considerably affects the 'convenience' of the public. Anyhow, that is a question that has to be examined. To my mind, so far as the Municipal Regulation is concerned, the provisions here are practically the same as elsewhere; and therefore Mr. Govinda Menon who cited the cases of Municipalities elsewhere might have tried to restrict cow-slaughter considerably at least within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Municipality at Parur before he brought it to this Council. My point was that, while there seems to be a provision in our Municipal laws, that provision seems not to have been taken advantage of.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Sherattalai*): Under the existing provisions, can the Municipalities prohibit the killing of cows?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): They may pass bye-laws. They may impose a condition that only persons who have obtained licenses from Municipalities could slaughter cows. If you cannot prohibit, you may at least regulate the slaughter. You may say that only a particular class of cows could be slaughtered. I only suggest that.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): One other point was mentioned by Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai about *Pinjrapoles*. Of course such charitable institutions are very desirable and I think they should be provided by persons who are charitably disposed. I think we will have to try to restrict and regulate the slaughter of cows as far as we can, before we proceed to legislate and before we request the Government to interfere in the matter and spend the money of the general tax-payer for that purpose. That is all that I have to say at present. Therefore, my point is that, in the absence of statistics, no necessity for legislation can be made out, and that we cannot ask the Government to interfere in the matter and legislate, especially when we are not in a position to know the varying religious sentiments of the various communities and religionists in the State.

[Mr. A. Hoogewerf.]

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Sir, I also beg to support the resolution. Certain reasons have been advanced by the mover of the resolution, and my friend Mr. Subba Aiyar thought that he would controvert them. First, he observed that no necessity had been made out for legislation upon the subject; that is to say, that for the protection of cows Mr. Govinda Menon had not made out a case, and that there was no necessity for this particular resolution. May I draw the attention of Mr. Subba Aiyar to the entire extinction of a species of cow that we had in Travancore by name Vechur cow which was a much-reputed variety of cows? So far as the Vechur cows are concerned, they have ceased to exist as a species.

Further, to make out by reference to statistics the necessity for the resolution, Mr. Subba Aiyar himself admits that statistics are not available on the subject. It is not the fault of Mr. Govinda Menon when he finds himself absolutely unable to refer to the statistics on the subject. I do not think Mr. Govinda Menon can be expected to manufacture statistics for purposes of reference on this resolution.

I would draw the attention of the House to one other fact.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I wish to know whether the extinction of the Vechur cow is due to butchery.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Certainly, to a considerable extent.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): The Vechur cows are very small. They yield a good deal of milk; but they are not fit for slaughter.

I do not think it would be profitable if the butcher purchased Vechur cows.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): They were very dainty, they say. (*Laughter*.)

In this connection, another fact may also be pointed out. Some ten or twenty years ago, cows used to cost only Rs. 10 or 12 each. Now, on account of the scarcity of cows, their price has gone up considerably. Therefore, it is a very clear indication of the fact that the number of cows is steadily going down. So, *prima facie* it clearly admits of being talked about.

Mr. Subba Aiyar raised further the question as to how it should be given effect to practically.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Hoogewerf wants to ask a question.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I wish to know whether Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai will tell us what will be the price of a Vechur cow now.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): It is now extinct like the dodo. (*Laughter*.)

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): What would have been the price before it was extinct?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Say, Rs. 40 or 50 per cow.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Will it be worth while for the butcher to go in for these small cows at such a high price?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): They say it is a very delicious dish. Mr. Subba Aiyar said that it was extremely difficult to give effect to the resolution in practice. He also referred to the religious aspect of the question and said that it was doubtful whether, if this resolution was carried, we would not be restricting the rights of other religionists. We have had the opinion of some of our Christian friends including Mr. Hoogewerf who say that they have absolutely no objection the protection of cows and my friend Mr. Daniel also quoted the Bible in support of the position.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I did not understand what he said about me.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I said "including Mr. Hoogewerf."

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I want to know what he said about me.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Does he want the meaning of the expression "included"?

PRESIDENT: He says he was not able to hear you.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am sorry. I said that some of our Christian friends including Mr. Hoogewerf had absolutely no objection to cows being encouraged to live on without being butchered.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I said there was the economic objection.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I shall come to that. As far as I am able to gather from Mr. Hoogewerf's speech, I think he is very sympathetically inclined towards the cow. With respect to the religious question, therefore, there is practically unanimity in this House, and no religion wants to slaughter the cow. Now, Sir, may I point out that the Hindu religion, or for that matter, any other religion does not require the slaughter of cows? Then in discussing this resolution, as well as in his general relations to other creations, the Hindu must take into consideration not only mankind but also the lower creation and probably even vegetables. The Hindu has been considering the cow as holy from the days of the Rig Veda. The Hindu has been mindful of the importance and usefulness of the cow and he was always fondling it. Therefore, Hindus are inclined very sympathetically towards the cow. In that sympathetic spirit, may I ask the other religionists and brethren belonging to other communities and religions whether there is anything in their faith requiring them to disagree with the mild Hindu? So much on the point of religion.

[President.]

Mr. Subba Aiyar said that it has been the tradition of Travancore to tolerate all religions. But I may point out that, so far as the Travancore Penal Code is concerned, we have gone a step further than British India and have exempted the Brahmin and women from capital punishment. Exemption of women from capital punishment the Hindu religion considers humane. As the present motion is only a humane measure, I am sure it will appeal to most of the members of this House. Because this exemption has been legalised in a Hindu State professing orthodox Hindu religion, it does not necessarily mean that it is a retrograde step and not in keeping with civilization. All the communities in the State are prepared to accept this measure of protecting the cow as a very useful animal. Therefore I think the State need not feel any doubt upon the subject of legislating.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Sir, will we not be trenching upon the social customs and usages of other religions?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Coming to the economic side of the question—

PRESIDENT: Mr. Hoogewerf has put a question.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I did not hear him.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): By legislation will we not trench upon the social customs and usages of other communities, e. g., Christians, Mahomedans, etc., etc.?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): With respect to the question only a part can be answered, because etc., etc., cannot be answered. (*Laughter.*)

PRESIDENT: He does not want you to answer *et ceteras*.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): The answer to the part minus the *et ceteras* is to the effect that it is not trenching upon anybody's customs and usages and religious beliefs. The observations of some of the non-Hindu members will show that they are extremely in sympathy with the resolution before the House.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I am not in sympathy with the proposal at all.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): With respect to the economic grounds, Mr. Subba Aiyar paraded some arguments. Mr. Hoogewerf raised the question whether, if the animals were allowed to multiply, men themselves would not ultimately have to go to the wall.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I am just closing. Mr. Hoogewerf raised the question whether, if tigers are allowed to multiply—

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Not tigers alone, bulls and all sorts of animals.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): He said various things. I take the particular instance of tigers. The Hindu religion does not say that no killing shall be done by any person. If for the purpose of saving life the slaughter of anything is absolutely necessary, the Hindu religion wants that lives should be saved even at the sacrifice of the lives of other animals. It is not only an aggressive action in the case of slaughter of tigers, *etc.*; certainly for the purpose of safety of human life the multiplication of wild animals in the world should be put a stop to. It does not therefore necessarily follow that a cow does not stand in need of protection. Mr. Subba Aiyar has been putting forward—

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): I like him to deal with all animals.

PRESIDENT: You cannot ask him to deal with this or that.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Will not the animals, if allowed to multiply unchecked, overrun our fields?

PRESIDENT: You are putting a hypothetical question.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Would Mr. Narayana Pillai tell us what will become if pigs are allowed to breed and multiply?

PRESIDENT: That is a hypothetical question. Mr. Narayana Pillai, your time is up.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): With these observations, so far as Mr. Subba Aiyar is concerned, he has been striving to prove that the resolution cannot be accepted. I beg to differ from him and I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution heartily.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Sir, I rise to support the resolution against cow-killing for the following reasons.

The supply of good cow's milk has become a rarity in this State and the price of milk has gone abnormally high. The people are suffering sorely on this account. Any one who has been to Pandi or anywhere else in British India cannot fail to be struck with the vast difference that there is in the quantity, quality and price of cow's milk available in both these localities. I am pretty sure that cow-slaughter is in a great measure responsible for this sad state of matters over here. Most of the people of Travancore, though they may take some meat and some fish by way of food, are practically vegetarians, when compared with the people of Europe, and cow's milk is an indispensable article of a vegetarian's dietary. The people, especially those with limited means, find it impossible to supply themselves and their family with the quantity of good milk indispensable for their sustenance, health and strength.

[Mr. T. Lakshmana Pillai.]

For want of cow's milk, people are suffering from great nervous prostration. In times of stress, and during the prevalence of epidemic diseases, such as cholera and small-pox, it becomes evident—and people find out only then—that they do not possess the nervous energy necessary to withstand the disease and also, when attacked by them, the energy necessary to support their lives during their pendency. The result is an abnormal increase in the death-rate. No external medication or remedy is sufficient to tide over these fundamental conditions. It is highly necessary that the evil must be traced to and eradicated at its very root; that is, people must be helped to stock themselves with sufficient nerve-power by a plentiful supply of cow's milk to be sold at moderate prices. The stopping of cow-slaughter would directly conduce to this result. If the matter has not been investigated by the Government as yet, I submit that it is of the utmost importance to do so early for the reasons stated above, with a view to a speedy solution of the present problem.

Some think that it is only the economic side of the question that should be taken into consideration by the Government, as if the authorities could not be humane as well as just. If so, there is no reason why the Government should encourage such a body as the S. P. C. A. It is evident, therefore, that we may appeal to the humanitarian side of Government also, especially the Government of a Hindu State of high traditions, ruled over by a Hindu Sovereign. It is well known that such an enactment as the one now asked for has been actually passed by some of the other Hindu States in India. I do not see why our benign Government which has gone so far as to countenance and encourage the S. P. C. A., should not go a step further and enact a law for the prohibition of cow-slaughter. Thus, it may be reasonably asked that those creatures of God which perform the function of the mother to us by giving us the milk out of their very bodies, and therefore held sacred by the Hindus, should be specially protected from slaughter.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): May I know from Mr. Lakshmana Pillai whether it is humanitarian to deprive the poor calf of the mother's milk and drink it yourself?

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): It is only a question of degree. I do not think it amounts to cruelty if we give sufficient milk to the calf and take the remainder for ourselves. It may reasonably be contended that, as they perform the function of a mother and are also held sacred by the Hindus, they require protection. This is neither superstition nor unreasonable sentiment. I am, of course, aware that there are those who, by the force of custom or immemorial habit, may not agree with this view, and may hold that cow's flesh may be freely eaten. These people, however, only form the minority. The question then is, is it not possible to have recourse to such flesh otherwise than by the slaughter of cows within the State as by the transport of beef from Australia? I believe it is possible, and therefore the prohibition of cow-slaughter within the State will not prejudicially affect them.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): What about the animals in the Public Gardens?

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): That is another matter. I think protection is being given in British India. As was pointed out in Bombay, the abnormally high rate of infant mortality is due to the slaughter of cows. So the slaughter of cows has been asked to be prohibited there. In any case, when the welfare and the good feeling of the majority of the people is vitally at stake, it may not be difficult for the minority to put up with a small inconvenience.

To the question as to what should be done with barren cows that are likely to become a burden on their owners, I would say, leave them to nature, and do not slaughter them. We do not slaughter barren women, and there is no more valid reason why you should destroy barren cows. The world is wide enough for their existence, and fertile enough for their sustenance.

Lastly, I do not think it is so easy to determine which is a barren cow, as some cows which originally appeared barren have, as the effect of a change of environment, become productive.

I do not see the force of the statement that, because we do not take up the question of stopping the slaughter of other animals, we should not take up the question of stopping cow-slaughter, seeing as I do that both the economic and humanitarian view-points strongly co-exist in the case of cows, and not with equal force in the case of the other animals. The question in the case of the other animals is mainly a humanitarian one.

To the observation that cows, if not killed, would increase and cause trouble to man, I have to put the question whether horses or donkeys overrun the earth and cause trouble to man, because a portion of them are not killed. As to the statement that the owner of a cow is at liberty to kill it or deal with it as he likes, this liberty I am quite prepared to concede, provided the slaughter is committed only in his own house and not in a public place, and provided the Government are not going to countenance it, as they do the public slaughter of cows now.

With these observations, I strongly support the resolution.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): I beg to move for a closure.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertalla*): I second it.

The motion for closure was put and lost.

MR. TRIVIKRAMAR VASUDEVAR (*Jemmies*): ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. ഗോവധം നിരത്തുക എന്നുള്ള കാര്യം തിരുവിതാംകൂർ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ നിലയ്ക്ക് ഏതുവിധവും അത്യാവശ്യമായിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നാണു എനിക്കാദ്യമായ പറയാനുള്ളത്. പാലിന്റെ ക്ഷാമം ആലോചിച്ചു നോക്കിയാൽ വളരെ സങ്കടം തോന്നുന്നതാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾ തിരുവനന്തപുരം ജനറൽ ആശുപത്രിയിൽ കിടക്ക

[Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai]

ന്ന രോഗികൾക്കെ അന്യദിക്കിലുള്ള തകർപ്പാലാണ് കടിച്ചുവരുന്നത്. ഇതിനു കാരണം നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിലുള്ള പശുക്കളുടെ കുറവാണ്. ഇവ ലോകത്തേക്കും പരലോകത്തേക്കും ഒന്നുപോലെ ഗുണമായിട്ടുള്ള കാത്രിയാണ് ഗോവധം നിറുത്തുന്നത്. കൃഷിയാവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കു വളം കിട്ടാതെ അനേകം കൃഷിക്കാർ കഷ്ടപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ട്. കൃത്രിമവളം ഉപയോഗിക്കാൻ എല്ലാവർക്കും ശക്തി ഉണ്ടായി എന്നു വരികയില്ല. അഥവാ ഉണ്ടായാൽ തന്നെയും ഉൾനാട്ടിലുള്ളവർക്ക് അവയെ കൃഷിസ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ കൊണ്ടുപോകുന്നതിനുള്ള വിഷമമാണ്. അവിടങ്ങളിൽ കന്നുകാലിവളവും പച്ചിലവളവും മാത്രമേ ഉപയോഗിച്ചുവരുന്നുള്ളൂ. അതു പശുക്കളിൽ നിന്നുമാത്രമെകിട്ടാനും തരമുള്ള (ഞാൻകാളയെ കൂടി ചേർത്താണ് പറയുന്നത്.) തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ആവശ്യത്തിനു വേണ്ട കന്നുകാലികളുടെ മൂന്നിൽ ഒരു ഭാഗം മാത്രമേയുള്ളൂ എന്നു സർക്കാർ പ്രസിദ്ധീകരണം കൊണ്ടു ബോധ്യപ്പെടുന്നുണ്ട്. കന്നുകാലികൾ ഇല്ലാതെ കൃഷി ചെയ്യാൻ സാധിക്കുകയില്ല. കൃഷിയുടെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയിലാണ് ജനങ്ങളുടെ കാഷ്ടേപമാർഗ്ഗം സ്ഥിതിചെയ്യുന്നത്. നമ്മുടെ സമുദായാചാരപ്രകാരം നോക്കുകയാണെങ്കിലും ഗോവധം വളരെ കഷ്ടമായിട്ടുള്ളതാണ്. പശുവിൽനിന്നു ലഭിക്കുന്ന പാൽ, തയിർ, നെയ്യ്, ചാണകം, മുതലും, ഇവ വളരെ ആവശ്യമുള്ളതും വളരെ ശുദ്ധമാണെന്നു ജനങ്ങൾ കരുതിവരുന്നതുമാണ്. ദേവന്മാർക്കു അഭ്യർത്ഥനയിൽ പഞ്ചഗവ്യം ഉപയോഗിച്ചുവരുന്നു. അതിൽ എന്തൊരു ഒരുവത സ്തം വന്നതായിരിക്കാം (ഘൃതം) അതിന്റെ മാംസത്തെ ഘൃതീകരിച്ചുവെക്കുന്നതിലൂടെ സമ്പ്രദായം കൊണ്ടുപോലെ മാംസഭക്ഷകൾക്കുശക്തിയില്ലെന്ന് അനേകം ഡാക്ടറന്മാർ അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ മാംസഭക്ഷണമില്ലാതെ തന്നെ മനുഷ്യർക്കു ധാരാളം ജീവിക്കാവുന്നതുമാണ്. വിശിഷ്ട ഈ തിരുവിതാംകൂറിലെ സ്ഥിതിയെപറ്റി ആലോചിച്ചു നോക്കുമ്പോൾ മറുഭിക്കുകാരെക്കാൾ ഇവിടുത്തുകാർക്കു ചിലപ്രത്യേകതയുണ്ടു കലക്കററചെയ്താലും ബ്രഹ്മണരേയും സ്മൃതികളേയും തുക്കിക്കൊല്ലാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു ചട്ടമുണ്ടു. അതുപോലെ ഈ വിഷയത്തിലും ഒരു ചട്ടമുണ്ടായിരിക്കുന്നതു ന്യായരഹിതമായിരിക്കുകയില്ല.

ഇത്രയും കാരണങ്ങളെ ആലോചിച്ചു തിരുവിതാംകൂറിൽ ഈ ഒരു കാര്യം വേഗത്തിൽ നടപ്പാക്കേണ്ടതു് അത്യാവശ്യമാകയാൽ ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തോടു വളരെ യോജിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (Commerce and Industries, North): Sir, the chief reason for pressing this motion upon this

House, it seems to me, is that it is a very cruel act to slaughter animals. Logically, the only ground on which—

MR. M. K. KHADIR PILLAI (*Nominated*): Louder, please.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): it can be enforced upon the House is that cruelty is involved in the slaughter of cows. If I am right in that surmise I think we ought to go further and protect not only cows but sheep, goats, poisonous snakes and lions and all other sentient animals. We know there are people who are very particular that no kind of animals should be slaughtered; they do not make any exception. If that is so, I can well understand the position. With regard to the subject of repugnance to the slaughter of cows, I think it is very greatly due to sentiment; it is the growth of local customs and considerations. But we know that sentiments are often changing. What is considered to be repulsive in certain countries by certain people at certain times are not objected to in other countries and at other times. The slaughter of cows for example is regarded with repugnance by the Hindu community on religious grounds. But I know a great majority of Christians, whose religion, so far as I know, does not prohibit the killing of cows, look upon such slaughter with extreme repugnance. I further know that with the growth of rationalism there are a considerable number of people whose sentiment is undergoing a rapid change. Therefore it is I say that the strength of the demand for the prohibition of slaughter of cows rests more upon sentiment than upon anything else.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): On what does the prohibition against manslaughter rest?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): It depends upon self-interest. Man has the power to insist that he shall not be slaughtered.

MR. JOSEPH PANJIKARAN (*Shertallai*): Infants and babies have no such power. Why could they not be slaughtered then?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): Because man loves his own babies. I have yet to learn that the objection of men to the slaughter of their fellowmen is equally applicable to the slaughter of lower animals. Logically we ought not to stop with prohibiting the killing of all sentient beings. We have got Professor Bose who has proved that not only animals but also plants have the same feelings of pain and pleasure that sentient beings have. The time may therefore come when the growth of consideration for the sufferings of sentient beings may be extended even to living plants.

With regard to the economic aspect, I am not at all sure that scarcity of milk is due to the slaughter of cows. People who know the habits and customs of the country are very well aware that milch cows are not at all slaughtered. It is only the barren cows that are being slaughtered and cows slaughtered form only a microscopic minority of the total number of cows in existence. The slaughter of these cows cannot at all account for the scarcity of milk. It is more due to the

[Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman.]

unscientific way of rearing cows and the indifferent feeding arrangements in vogue.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Sir, may I know from the member how many cows are being slaughtered?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): I am not aware. Again it is economically unsound to kill a milch cow. A milch cow may fetch anything between Rs. 20 and Rs. 150; a butcher will not at all find it worth while to buy and slaughter a milch cow on such a high price. That being the case, it is not at all reasonable for us to argue that milch cows are being slaughtered in any large numbers. The slaughter of cows, I am positive, is not one of the reasons for the scarcity of milk in the country. In this connection, I recall a lecture delivered years ago by Dr. Giffard, late Surgeon General to the Government of Madras. He said that if medical science went on making such rapid strides of advance as it has been doing recently, there might come a time when diseases might be completely abolished and man might go on living for such a length of time that it might become a serious problem as to how to dispose of our ancestors. Similarly, if we protect all kinds of animals, the prospect is not at all very attractive. I have often thought that it would be more merciful to slaughter some of the old cows which have long passed their period of service. Owing to sentimental considerations, I find that people are not at all prepared to sell them to the butchers. In such cases, persons like Mr. Hoogewerf have their pension for maintaining such cows. There are other people who have not even a pension to fall back upon, but who retain such cows on starvation rations as an eyesore to all passers-by.

In western countries like America and England, there is no such prohibition. Even then there is no scarcity of milk there.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): My I know whether there is any other reason why the price of milk has gone up?

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): I think the scarcity of milk is a sufficient reason. Laws of supply and demand are sufficiently powerful influences for the regulation of prices. I find that, among the arguments trotted out in support of the motion, there is a good deal of sentimental cant. I regret that, on a careful consideration of all circumstances, I feel bound to oppose this motion.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha*): മനുഷ്യർ ജന്തുക്കളെ ഒന്നിനെയുംതന്നെ ഹിംസിക്കാതിരിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം അതു അധികം നല്ലതാണെന്നാണ് എന്റെപക്ഷം. എന്നാൽ ഭൂരിപക്ഷം മനുഷ്യരും ജന്തുക്കളെ ഹിംസിക്കുന്നവരാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഗവർണ്ണമെൻറിൽ നിന്നു ഭൂരിപക്ഷത്തിന്റെ ഹിതത്തിനു വിപരീതമായി ഹിംസിക്കാൻ

പാടില്ല എന്ന് ഒരുനിയമം ഏല്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതെന്നു നന്നായിരിക്കുകയില്ല. ജീവകാരുണ്യത്തെ മാത്രം വിചാരിച്ചാണെങ്കിൽ എല്ലാ ജന്തുക്കളേയും ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തേണ്ടതാണ്. ഹിന്ദുമതസംബന്ധമായി നോക്കുമ്പോൾ ഗോവധം നിഷിദ്ധമാണ്. എന്നാൽ ക്രിസ്തുമതപ്രകാരവും മഹമ്മദമതപ്രകാരവും അതു നിഷിദ്ധമല്ല. ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികളും മഹമ്മദിയരും ഇങ്ങനെ ചെയ്യുന്നതു കൊണ്ടുഹിന്ദു മതക്കാരായ സമോദരങ്ങൾക്കു പാപമുണ്ടെന്ന് അവർ വിചാരിക്കുന്നെങ്കിൽ അവരുടെ സമാധാനത്തിനുവേണ്ടി ഈ പ്രമേയം പാസാക്കുന്നതിൽ ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിയാണ്. എന്നെന്നാൽ ക്രിസ്തുമതപ്രകാരവും മഹമ്മദമതപ്രകാരവും ഗോവധം ചെയ്യണമെന്നു നിബന്ധമില്ല. ഹിന്ദുക്കൾ മാത്രം അനുഷ്ഠിച്ചാൽ മതി. മറ്റുള്ളവരെ നിബന്ധിച്ചു നിയമത്താൽ ബന്ധിക്കേണ്ട എന്നാണ് ഹിന്ദുമതത്തിലെ തത്വമെങ്കിൽ ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു പ്രമേയം ആവശ്യമില്ലെന്നാണ് എനിക്കു തോന്നുന്നത്. എന്റെ സഭാ ഉള്ള അഭിപ്രായം യാതൊരു ജന്തുക്കളേയും ഉപദ്രവിക്കുതിരിക്കാമെങ്കിൽ അധികം നല്ലതാണെന്നാണ്. ജനങ്ങളുടെ മതത്തെയോ ജീവകാരുണ്യത്തെയോ, ധനപരിപോഷണത്തെയോ ഏതെങ്കിലും ഒരു തത്വത്തെ വെച്ചുകൊണ്ടു നിയമരൂപേണ തടയാൻ കാരണമില്ലെങ്കിൽ നിയമം ഏല്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത് ഒരിക്കലും യുക്തമല്ലെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

ധനപരിപോഷണം സംബന്ധിച്ചാണെങ്കിൽ പശുക്കളെ കൊല്ലാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു നിയമം ഏല്പിച്ചതിയാൽ അതിനുപകരം കൂടുതൽ കാര്യങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടും അതുകൊണ്ട് ഉദ്വിഗ്ന പ്രയാസമായിതീരും. അതു ധനാഭിവൃദ്ധിക്കു തടസ്സമല്ലേ? മറ്റു മതസ്ഥർ ഗോവധം ചെയ്യുന്നതു തങ്ങൾക്കു പാപകരമാണെന്നു വിചാരിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ എന്റെ ഹിന്ദുക്കളായ സമോദരന്മാർക്കു മനുഷ്യശരം ഉണ്ടാക്കണമെന്നു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. അങ്ങനെ വല്ലതും ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ പറഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം. ക്രിസ്ത്യാനികളും മഹമ്മദിയരുംകൂടി ഗോവധത്തിൽനിന്നു ഒഴിഞ്ഞിരിക്കേണ്ടതു അവരുടെ സുഖജീവിതത്തിന് ആവശ്യമാണെന്നു മതത്തിൽ ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ മാനുസ്ക്രീഫിതന്മാരെ നിങ്ങളിൽ ആരെങ്കിലും പറയുവിൻ. എന്നാൽ ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കാൻ തയ്യാറാണ്. അതു പ്രമേയം പ്രയോഗിച്ച ആൾ തന്നെ പറഞ്ഞാലും മതി.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): ഞാൻ ഒരു ഗ്ലോക്കത്തിന്റെ അർത്ഥം പറഞ്ഞല്ലോ.

MR. TARIATU KUNJITOMMAN (*Muvattupuzha*): ഗ്ലോക്കത്തിന്റെ സാരം മറ്റു മതസ്ഥരെക്കൂടി ഉൾപ്പെടുത്തുന്ന വാഗ്മാനോ?

[Mr. S. Subrahmanya Karayalar.]

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): ഹിന്ദുരാജാക്കന്മാരുടെ രാജ്യത്തിൽ അങ്ങനെ ചെയ്യുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ അതുരാജാവിനു പാപമാണെന്നാണ്.

MR. S. SUBRAHMANYA KARAYALAR (*Pattanapuram cum Shencottah*): Sir, Mr. A. Govinda Menon, the mover of this proposition, deserves to be heartily congratulated for having brought a proposition of this nature at least for the consideration of this House. If legislation prohibiting the killing of cows in this State can be achieved, the learned mover, I am sure, will attain salvation, as all cows in this State at least will bless his noble soul. If his object is achieved, I will be the next mover for a second piece of legislation prohibiting the killing of all animals, by doing which we will be only giving effect to the golden precept of the sages of the past. In this connection, I will be failing in my duty as a Tamilian if I do not quote two of the well-known aphorisms from the *kural* of Tiruvalluva Nayanar:—

- (1) ஒன்றாக நல்லது கொல்லாமை ;
மற்றதன் பின்சார பொய்யாமை நன்று.
- (2) தன்னுயிர் நீப்பினும் கருதற்க தாண்டிரிதோ
நின்னுயிர் நீக்கும் வினே.

The first of these two *kurals* is that the noblest thing that a man is expected to do on this earth is that he should refrain from killing any animal, even if by so doing he will be obliged to lose his life.

It is all well and good to preach from a public platform the golden precepts of sages and learned men of the past, but the legitimate work of this House has its own limitation and jurisdiction; and any attempt to transgress the limit will soon launch it in difficulties of an insurmountable nature. If the learned mover could by some divine power turn human beings into vegetarians, there would be no necessity for the introduction of a proposition of the nature now moved by him in this House.

I need not submit to this House that the whole animal kingdom except the *nandis* in our temples are a prey to human beings within and outside and so it would be a vain attempt to bring propositions of this nature in Legislative Council chambers consisting of mortals.

If we take the food problem into consideration, even when we live upon the animals on the face of the earth, fish and other living beings under water and birds wherever found, there is famine everywhere and starvation throughout; and so any attempt to legislate on a matter like the one before the House may not be productive of good and so it is better if the House can confine itself to things concerning the interest of mankind at large. Of course,

ஊணை ததின்னு ஊணைப்பெடுக்காமை முன்னினைதே.

As there is no agreement between man and man about the advisability of killing or not of animals for man's use, let us pray God to work upon the mind of men and prevent them from killing the creations of the same God.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): Sir, I do not propose to say anything about the humanitarian or the religious side of the subject under discussion. But I may speak a few words on the economic aspect of the question. This aspect has been very cleverly discussed. I believe my friend Mr. Govinda Menon urged the killing of cows as one of the causes of the deterioration of cattle in this country. Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai came out with a concrete instance of the Vechur breed of cows having become extinct by cow-slaughter.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): I said cow-slaughter *a/so*.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): I cannot agree that cow-slaughter is to any extent responsible for the extinction of this breed. There are various causes in this country which contribute to the deterioration of cattle, and my own information is—and from my own experience I can say—that the extinction of that particular breed of cows was due to the indiscriminate breeding that had been going on. No attempt had been made to keep the breed pure. It is a recognised principle in breeding that, unless you keep a breed pure, or if you go on crossing breeds of different qualities, in the end that pure breed will become extinct. That, I believe, is the fundamental cause of the extinction of the Vechur breed of cow.

Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai also pointed out that the price of cows has gone very high on account of cow slaughter. Well, not only has the price of cows, but that of everything else has gone up. The price of all commodities has gone up and the figures that I have before me in regard to the number of cattle in Travancore do not warrant the conclusion that Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai has come to. According to the cattle censuses taken in 1911 and 1921, I find that the total number of cows and cow calves in the year 1911 was 4,38,182 and in the year 1921 it was 4,36,930, or an insignificant decrease of about 1,252. This small decrease cannot certainly bring about an increase in the price which Mr. Narayana Pillai wants to attribute to it. I contend that the price of cows has gone up along with the general rise in the price of all articles; and it cannot certainly be conceded that the slaughter of cows and the consequent decrease in their number is the chief cause of this increase in the price.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): May I know whether there was not an increase in the ratio of population during the interval?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): I believe the population of the State was 34 lakhs in 1911 and about 40 lakhs in 1921.

[Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai.]

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): Is it not natural that, when the number of people increases and the number of cattle decreases, the prices should rise?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): There may be an increase in the price on account of the slaughter of cows, but that cannot be the chief cause. The argument that it is due to the increase in population applies to all articles. Increase in population and increased demand naturally lead to an increase in the prices of articles.

In regard to the insufficiency of the number of cattle Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar gave the House some figures. I believe he has taken them from the latest Census Report.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): He quoted from a speech made by you.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): The Census Report seems to be his authority for the number of cattle required for ploughing in Travancore. I shall read the relevant portion from the Report which says:

"3 pairs of bulls, each working for five to six hours a day, are required for ploughing once one acre of land, and six to eight such ploughings are necessary for sowing. * * * In Madras, one pair of bulls is required for ploughing four acres of land but the fields are not ploughed six to eight times."

"The number available in the State is just below one-third of what is actually required".

From the above, the Census Commissioner concludes that the number of cattle in Travancore is less than half the number actually required. I am afraid he has gone wrong in his calculation, because he has taken one month in the year as the period of ploughing. But we know as a matter of fact that cattle are being used for ploughing for three or more months in the year. The number we have is sufficient for our purpose. The Census Commissioner's estimate is not quite correct. If, however, we improve the breed of cattle, we can even do with a smaller number. It is more economical to maintain a smaller number of good, efficient cattle than a larger number of bad, inefficient ones. If 3,00,000 bulls are now used in ploughing the lands under cultivation, and if with 2,00,000 bulls the work can be done equally well, the economic advantage is quite clear. There is certainly a saving in maintaining 2,00,000 bulls instead of 3,00,000.

The same remark applies to milch cows also. We have got cows giving one *nali* and sometimes half a *nali* of milk, and, as my friend Mr. Hoogewerf said, even such a cow costs four annas a day. This is a slight exaggeration. It may be four chuckrams. It is much more economical to maintain a cow giving about two *edangalis* of milk than one giving only one *nali* of milk.

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): May I know what remedy he would propose to see that those cows

which give only one *nali* of milk daily are disposed of before going in for better cattle?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): One way of disposal is the slaughter that is going on. (*Laughter*.) I say it is more efficient and cheaper to maintain cows and bullocks of a better breed, though smaller in number, than a large number of inefficient or useless ones. The real question then is the improvement of the breed of cattle. The present breeds of cattle in the country are certainly not good and there are certain classes of cows which ought to be weeded out. The absolute prohibition of the slaughter of cows will only increase the number of such bad cows. But if slaughter is not absolutely prohibited the chances are that all these useless animals will in course of time be slaughtered and that by introducing better breeds from outside or by crossing local breeds with imported ones it may be possible to bring into existence a better class of cattle.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): How long will it take?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): It depends upon the resources and the co-operation of the people.

MR. N. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Supposing everything is possible?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): It is not easy to say how long it will take. It may take years and even generations.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): As a rule, people do not slaughter or allow to be slaughtered good cows or bullocks. It is only the useless animals that they either slaughter or allow to be slaughtered. In the case of bulls, there is one safety. You can prevent bad bulls from breeding by castrating them. But in the case of cows this is not possible and they should be disposed of otherwise.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): Why not allow them to die naturally?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): Before their death they will produce ever so many offspring.

MR. T. LAKSHMANA PILLAI (*Nominated*): So, is it not a question of bad cows being killed?

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): From an economic point of view it is not at all desirable to absolutely prohibit the killing of cows.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know whether you are in favour of not slaughtering good cows?

PRESIDENT: The resolution is for absolute prohibition of cow-killing.

[Mr A. Govinda Menon.]

MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Nedumangad*): I wish to ask whether the deterioration of cattle is not mainly due to absence of good fodder in Travancore.

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): It may be one of the causes.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): Sir, I have carefully heard the arguments except in the case of Mr. Mammen Mappillai. I was unable to ascertain what he actually said. All the arguments advanced by those who want somehow or other to prevent a resolution like this from being passed are neither economical nor logical. I will take the latter case first.

Those who adopted one kind of logic say that, if you strictly adhere to the humanitarian principle, you must extend it to all other animals. I shall take an instance to illustrate that kind of logic. Suppose two beggars ask for alms from a man. If he has money enough only to satisfy one, does it mean that they should both be driven away without even giving a single pie to them? That is an absolutely useless and worthless kind of logic. (*Laughter.*) You must do what you can. Of course there is a limit beyond which each of us would not be able to go.

As for the arguments on the economic side, I think it is rather too late to say that on economic grounds the slaughter of cows need not be prohibited. Even Dr. Kunjan Pillai was rather not very emphatic in his assertion as regards that point. The difficulty is that he himself admitted in the discussion some two months ago when the resolution was passed—

DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Director of Agriculture and Fisheries*): I did not express an opinion then either for or against the resolution discussed by the Economic Development Board. Of course, the resolution was passed, I know. I was the President but did not commit myself to any view.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): At any rate that was not my impression. I saw only the resolution in the papers.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Was the other side properly represented?

PRESIDENT: That does not arise.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): All the literature I have been able to read, from the pen of men like Sir John Woodroffe, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and so many other people who have taken a keen interest in this question an interest which nobody else has ever taken, at least in these parts, even including Dr. Kunjan Pillai leads me to think that these people are emphatically of the opinion that cow-slaughter should be prohibited, although in the case of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, you may think that he has been influenced by the religious side also.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Will Mr. Govinda Menon read the reply of the Viceroy?

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I am sorry I cannot attach much weight to that pronouncement. The Viceroy has not worded the reply exactly according to the logical conclusions. We can more or less understand his position. He is not his own master and has so many difficulties to contend against, so many interests to satisfy, that he will be led to say things inconsistent with logic or sometimes with his conscience. (*Laughter.*) Not that I do not attach any value to the utterance of the Viceroy; but I do not accept the soundness of the view expressed by him.

MR. A. HOOGEWERF (*Nominated*): Did you read it?

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): I have read it, but not now. It seems to me that it was not very sound. It is not a disparagement to the Viceroy to say so. I think if I were in that position I would have done the same thing. It is the pronouncement of a diplomat.

All that I say is that there is absolutely no ground advanced that this resolution cannot be passed in this House. Of course, to take action on the resolution is left to the Government, but, in my humble opinion, I think, in the face of the opinions expressed here, nobody has stated anything against it upon the religious ground. The one man having a right to do so was Mr. Khadir Pillai. I know there are some Mahomedans who advocate cow-slaughter. But he has never advanced such a view. Moreover, men like Messrs. Chotani, Mahomed Ali and others whose names may not be quite welcome to some here (*Laughter*) but whose opinions and judgment in matters like economic questions and religious questions could not be questioned, have said that there is nothing obligatory on the part of Mahomedans to sacrifice cows and cows alone. They are against cow-slaughter. Even Mr. Kunjitomman does not eat cow's flesh. His family never uses it. They belong to an old family. There is a certain respect which they attach to cows. There are no doubt others who use cow's flesh, but any restriction that may be put upon this variety of beef will not prevent the ample supply of other kinds of meat in the case of those who want it for their food. All that I say and all that I request is that at least in principle all the members of this House should kindly accept the resolution.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): May I know whether he was aware of the observation of Mr. Mammen Mappillai that there was much of sentimental cant underlying the resolution?

PRESIDENT: I do not think that Mr. Mammen Mappillai used that expression.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): I said that there is a lot of cant said about it by some persons. I am sorry Mr. Narayana Pillai has misunderstood me.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): So far as I am concerned, I have not used cow's flesh or any flesh. I am a pure vegetarian and that itself testifies to my earnestness and sincerity. I therefore leave it to the Council.

[Mr. V. Subba Aiyar.]

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): My question is whether you propose to take notice of the fact that you oppose cow-killing as a sentimental cant.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): I did not say that. I myself said—

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Is he in order? My question is addressed to Mr. Govinda Menon who is in possession of the House.

PRESIDENT: You are ascribing to him what he says he has not said.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): If he says I am mistaken, I withdraw. Mr. Mammen Mappillai says he did not use the expression with respect to the persons who oppose cow-killing.

MR. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI (*Commerce and Industries, North*): I did not use that. I said all must have got a lot of sympathy, but among the arguments that I have heard on all sides there is a lot of cant mixed up with sound arguments.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I may say this, that the scarcity of milk that is mentioned is not exactly due to the decrease in the number of cows but to the decline in the quality of cows, so that that argument cannot hold water. The argument for legislation is based upon the three grounds I mentioned. As for the humanitarian ground, I ask why the measure is not to be extended to other animals. On the basis of religion we cannot interfere. On the economic ground there seems to be a difference of opinion even among the members of the House and Dr. Kunjan Pillai is emphatic on the point.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): What about similar legislation in other States?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am not aware of any such. I do not think legislation can be undertaken on these grounds.

One point was made as to the difference between exceptions in the case of Brahmins and women and it was urged that similar exceptions might be made here also. What the Penal Code did was to give legal recognition to the customs then existing. What we are asked to do is to abrogate existing customs or usages which do not prohibit the killing of cows, and make it penal to kill cows hereafter. That makes all the difference. I believe that difference is very vital in any piece of legislation.

I have got nothing more to add than to urge that in the circumstances that I mentioned—and as a matter of fact the members are opposed to it—it will be rather a delicate task for the Government to undertake a piece of legislation which is likely to wound the susceptibilities of other religionists.

MR. A. GOVINDA MENON (*Alangad cum Parur*): None of them say that the prohibition of cow-slaughter interferes with their religious duties.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): At any rate, we do not know what the Mahomedans think.

The resolution was put to the vote and lost, 19 voting for and 21 against.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): I demand a poll.

The poll was then taken with the following result:—

AYES—20

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. T. M. Chidambaranu Pillai. | 11. Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai. |
| 2. Mr. Paul V. Daniel. | 12. Mr. M. N. Pillai. |
| 3. Mr. A. Govinda Menon. | 13. Mr. N. Padmanabha Pillai. |
| 4. Mr. C. P. Kochukunju Pillai. | 14. Mr. K. Paramesvaran Pillai. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar. | 15. Mr. G. Paramesvaran Pillai. |
| 6. Mr. S. Krishna Aiyar. | 16. Mr. P. Paramesvaran. |
| 7. Mr. T. Kumara Pillai. | 17. Mr. N. Ramakrishna Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. V. Kunjukrishna Pillai. | 18. Mr. S. Subrahmanya Karayalar. |
| 9. Mr. T. Lakshmana Pillai. | 19. Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar. |
| 10. Mr. M. R. Madhava Variar. | 20. Mr. T. K. Velu Pillai. |

NOES—21

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Mr. I. C. Chacko. | 11. Mr. K. C. Mammen Mappillai. |
| 2. Mr. R. Dhanukoti Pillai. | 12. Mr. K. V. Natesa Aiyar. |
| 3. Mr. L. C. Hodgson. | 13. Mr. R. Nilakanda Pillai. |
| 4. Mr. A. Hoogewerf. | 14. Mr. S. Paramesvara Aiyar. |
| 5. Mr. M. K. Khadir Pillai. | 15. Mr. W. H. Pitt. |
| 6. Mr. R. Krishna Pillai. | 16. Mr. M. Raja Raja Varma. |
| 7. Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai. | 17. Rao Bahadur K. V. Ranga-swami Aiyangar. |
| 8. Mr. Tariatu Kunjitomman. | 18. Mr. S. C. H. Robinson. |
| 9. Rev Fr. Kuriakose Vettikappalli. | 19. Mr. Dominic Tomman. |
| 10. Dewan Bahadur Dr. P. N. Lakshmanan. | 20. Mr. V. Subba Aiyar. |
| | 21. Mr. A. J. Van Ross. |

The resolution was lost.

Appointment of a Retrenchment Committee.

MR. M. R. MADHAVA VARIAR (*Chengannur cum Pattanam-titta*): Sir, I beg to move the following resolution:

This Council recommends to the Government that a committee consisting of the official and non-official members of this Council be appointed to consider the question of further retrenchment in public expenditure.